

LIBRARY  
MEDICAL ROOM  
DIV. OF MED.

DEC 16 1930

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).  
Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In the United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere \$2.50.  
Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOLUME XXIV, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1930

WHOLE NO. 646

*Make your sequence an Ullman and Henry one*

with

## THIRD LATIN BOOK

By ULLMAN, HENRY and WHITE

It carries on the excellence which is making

ELEMENTARY LATIN

NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN

SECOND LATIN BOOK

SECOND LATIN BOOK (REVISED)

triumphant in the field of Secondary School Latin

The new member of the

MACMILLAN CLASSICAL SERIES

B. L. ULLMAN  
General Editor

**T**HIRD Latin Book diverges from the usual Ciceronian diet given Latin students in the third year. Here is a wealth of material from classical literature suited in subject and difficulty to students of this level. It has been selected to develop maximum facility in reading the language, together with maximum appreciation of Roman life and culture.

### Contents

CAESAR'S CIVIL WAR (SELECTIONS)	SENECA (SELECTIONS)
PLINY AND GELLIUS (SELECTIONS)	MACROBIUS AND QUINTILIAN (SELECTIONS)
PETRONIUS (SELECTIONS)	CICERO AND SALLUST (SELECTIONS)
OVID'S METAMORPHOSES	

Ingeniously combined with the reading material are vocabulary drills, syntax, and word-studies, making unnecessary the use of a separate Grammar.

Beautifully illustrated in color, and in black and white half-tones. \$2.20

### THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York Boston Chicago Dallas Atlanta San Francisco

## THE HISTORICAL-CULTURAL BACKGROUND

which has been emphasized so strongly in the *Recommendations of the Report of the Classical Investigation* has been carefully incorporated in various important features of Professor Place's two Latin books. The student acquires this valuable, sympathetic understanding of ancient life and history through the Introduction and the Notes, the human-interest stories presenting classic tales, the accounts in English, etc., etc.

The new Place Latin books are in harmony with the *Requirements of the College Entrance Board*. According to their improved method of teaching, the more difficult grammatical forms and principles and syntax are postponed until the beginning of the second year. The student does not begin the reading of Caesar so early but this sounder foundation enables him to progress more rapidly and surely.

Place's First Year Latin . . . . .	\$1.32
Intermediate Latin Lessons . . . . .	.40
First Year Latin. Enlarged. Including Intermediate Latin Lessons . . . . .	1.40
Place's Second Latin Course . . . . .	1.68

---

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIV, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1930

WHOLE No. 646

## VERGIL AND THE ROMAN FORUM<sup>1</sup>

It is no secret that the Roman Forum is a distinct disappointment to a large proportion of those who visit it. A thing of beauty may not have been expected. But even the illusion of a previous splendor seems scarcely justified by the unsightly ruins that survive. Mortar, bricks, and stones may intrigue the fancy of an archaeologist, but they are not likely, in themselves, to be especially interesting to the uninitiate.

In Augustan times, if Professor Rostovtzeff<sup>2</sup> is correct, the monuments in the Forum "impressed the population, not because they were beautiful, but because in their picturesque language they said the same things as the poets expressed, things which everybody felt to be perfectly true..."<sup>3</sup> It is probable that the Forum was never either in essence or even in intention a work of art. Its function, its message were outstandingly symbolical. This symbolical purpose the Forum, even in its present ruined state, continues to perform.

One who visits the Forum must, then, possess two essentials: the ability to recognize the exact nature of the objects serving as symbols, and the power to interpret rightly the symbolism that is based on this material evidence. The first of these essentials can be gained only in part from a Baedeker. A certain modicum of archaeological (as well as historical) information is needed. The second essential is supplied ideally by a poet, Vergil or Horace, who senses the spirit of his age and lifts his voice in exalted strain to hymn the praises of his people. In the light of Vergil or Horace the mere impression of a *caduceus* on the portal of the Aedes Concordiae Augustae tells a story that is not to be found in any guide-book or work on history. No one but a poet possesses the inner eye, the power that knows how to reveal the spiritual significance of great men and great events. The artistic language of poetry is needed to interpret the artistic language of symbolism.

The span of time covered by the ruins in the Forum presents a very considerable problem. What we have is a composite of the ages. For any particular period there is much that must be thought away, much that must be recreated in the imagination. The very sight of the valley encircled by hills recalls the time when, as Ovid puts it (*Fasti* 6.401), *Hoc, ubi nunc fora sunt,*

*udae tenuere paludes*, the time when independent *oppida* nestled on the hill-slopes. Excavations have traced the steps of man on this site from the Early Iron Age, before Rome began, to a time when a declining Rome, forgetful of her proud past, could rear a shaft (the Column of Phocas) in disgraceful flattery to the usurper in the East. So long is the story, so diverse the details (*longae ambages*)!

One can hardly more fittingly begin a visit to the Forum than by approaching it from the Trastevere side of the Ponte Palatino. From this point can be approximated the experiences of Aeneas as he caught his first glimpse of Rome from the Tiber and was led, by Evander (8.97-100), to the place where later the Forum was set. As one passes on to the Forum by the Via Bocca della Verità and the Via della Consolazione, it is not difficult to visualize Evander and his distinguished guest moving on their way through the Forum Boarium (8.307-312, 337-341). At this juncture (342-346), Evander, in the language of W. Warde Fowler<sup>4</sup>,

points out the slopes of the Capitoline covered with dense wood, where Romulus afterwards placed his sanctuary for refugees; and then, on the steep side of the Palatine, the Lupercal where the she-wolf was to nurse the twins. Straight ahead was the wooded dell bringing a little stream down into the Forum, and known in historical times as the Argiletum.

Proceeding from the altar of Carmenta (the Porta Carmentalis was probably close to the intersection of the streets mentioned above), Evander brings the Trojan leader to the edge of the Capitol (347-348). We, emulating this historic walk, shall do well to stop when we come (by the Via della Consolazione) to the southwest corner of the Forum, and allow Vergil to complete the story, since the scene referred to is spread out before us (8.359-365)<sup>5</sup>:

Talibus inter se dictis ad tecta subibant  
pauperis Euandri, passimque armenta videbant  
Romanoque Foro et lautis mugire Carinis  
Ut ventum ad sedes, "Haec", inquit, "limina victor  
Alcides subiit, haec illum regia cepit.  
Aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum  
finge deo, rebusque veni non asper egenis".  
Dixit, et angusti subter fastigia tecti  
ingentem Aenean duxit stratisque locavit,  
effultum foliis et pelle Libystidis ursae.  
Nox ruit et fuscis tellurem amplectitur alis.

After the eye has followed both guide and guest along the Via Sacra to the lowly palace on the Palatine, no view of the Palatine from the Forum could fail to recall Vergil's picture of royal host in his modest abode—a prototype of the Augustus that was to be (455-456).

It was close to the Temple of Saturn (i. e. on the road outside the excavations) that our progress was momen-

<sup>1</sup>In this paper the expressions "the Forum" and "the Roman Forum" refer to what is sometimes called, more exactly, the Forum Romanum Magnum.

<sup>2</sup>Since every reader of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY will have at his command a complete text of Vergil (at least of the Aeneid), and since the pressure on the space of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is very heavy, passages in the Aeneid will seldom be quoted here in full. References like 1.201-205 are to the Aeneid. C. K. >

<sup>3</sup>The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, 44 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1926. See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 22.13-15).

<sup>4</sup>Professor Rostovtzeff has here put the cart before the horse. C. K. >

<sup>5</sup>Aeneas at the Site of Rome<sup>3</sup>, 73 (Oxford, Blackwell, 1918).  
<sup>4</sup>W. Warde Fowler, Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero, Chapter I (New York, Macmillan, 1909), makes fine use of this whole passage: see especially 1-3. C. K. >

tarily arrested. A glance is sufficient to suggest four important stages in the history and the development of the site. The ugly granite columns belong to the final restoration of the temple, in the fourth century A. D.; the travertine walls of the *podium* date from the rebuilding by Plancus, in 42 B. C.; the generous use of cappellaccio in the concrete (actual fragments of cappellaccio masonry can be seen on closer examination on the north and the east sides) recalls the Republican temple of 497 B. C., the earliest temple in the Forum; the Republican temple itself replaced an altar which, according to tradition, occupied this site. The persistence of cappellaccio in later restorations evinces the Romans' scrupulous practice of incorporating once-consecrated material in a reconstructed shrine. There is, besides, a peculiar appropriateness in the fact that a temple which harks back to the Saturnian Age preserves so much of the earliest building material employed at Rome. That the temple was used as a state treasury is easily understandable of a structure that from earliest times had symbolized peace and plenty, security and prosperity—a prosperity based on the bounty of fields and crops (compare *Aeneid* 8. 319–325; *Georgics* 2. 458–474, 532–540). As early as 40 B. C. Vergil could sing of Saturn's return to the haunts of men (*Eclogues* 4. 4–7),

Ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas;  
magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo.  
Iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna;  
iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto.

All the while we have been standing at the foot of the Capitoline (i. e. in the Via del Foro Romano). Turning aside from the Forum, we ascend the steps to our left and make a detour that will take in the *arces* of the Capitoline before we actually enter the enclosure of the excavations.

A view of the Capitoline easily calls to mind the concession of Juno, *stet Capitolium fulgens* (Horace, *Carmina* 3.3.42–43). No longer now does the Capitol stand gleaming. But neither was it *fulgens* when Evander led Aeneas to the foot of this hill (8. 347–348):

Hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia ducit,  
aurea nunc, olim silvestribus horrida dumis.

Yet Vergil's inner eye could look upon the Capitol as symbolizing even at that early time what it came to mean to the mind of the Roman and what it still will represent for us, if we can but understand the language of poetry (8.349–354):

Iam tum religio pavidos terrebat agrestis  
dira loci, iam tum silvam saxumque tremebant.  
"Hoc nemus, hunc", inquit, "frondoso vertice collem,  
quis deus incertum est, habitat deus; Arcades ipsum  
credunt se vidisse Iovem, cum saepe nigram  
aegida concuteret dextra nimbosque cieret".

In the Via di Monte Tarpeo (on the south summit of the Capitoline) can be seen the cappellaccio *podium*\* of the Aedes Iovis Optimi Maximi. As was noted above, cappellaccio construction has the power of conjuring up before the mind interesting mementos of Etruscan and early Republican times. It appeals to the

imagination to think that one can look upon the actual foundations on which, tradition says, the Tarquins built the first temple to Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, a temple that was to enjoy an unexampled importance in the affairs of the Roman State. There is no trouble in picturing the *Capitolini summum penetrale Tonantis*, towering high above the temples in the Forum and seeming to reach into the sky itself.

In Vergil's day the Aedes Concordiae Augustae had not yet been built. The Julian Forum must have stood out prominently to one looking down from the Capitol. Had Vergil ever thought of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus as smiling serenely on the resplendent shrine of Venus below (see 1. 254–271)?

Our position in front of Jupiter's temple brings back to us the scene on the Shield of Aeneas (8. 652–662):

In summo custos Tarpeiae Manlius arcis  
stabat pro templo, et Capitolia celsa tenebat,  
Romuleoque recens horrebat regia culmo.  
Atque hic auratis volitans argenteus anser  
porticibus Gallos in limine adesse canebat;  
Galli per dumos aderant arcemque tenebant,  
defensi tenebris et dono noctis opacae:  
aurea caesaries ollis atque aurea vestis;  
virgatis lucent sagulis; tum lactea colla  
auro innectuntur; duo quisque Alpina coruscant  
gaesa manu, scutis protecti corpora longis.

Moving toward the north summit of the Capitoline we come to the Piazza del Campidoglio, the site of the *Lucus Asyli*. The Arx, the height on which Camillus built the Temple of Iuno Moneta, in 344 B. C., lies directly north of us. In the Giardino dell' Ara, to the east of the Capitoline Museum, there can be seen still *in situ* a wall of Fidenae tufa, which, because of its position and orientation, its technique, and the limited period during which this material was used at Rome, must be assigned to the foundations of the temple erected by Camillus. Vergil, in describing the temple built by Dido to Juno, seems to have had in mind the topography of this site and the appearance of the Temple of Iuno Moneta in his own day (1. 446–449):

Hic templum Iunoni ingens Sidonia Dido  
condebant, donis opulentum et numine divae,  
aerea cui gradibus surgebant limina nexaeque  
aere trabes; foribus cardo stridebat aenis.

From the top of the steps leading down from the Piazza del Campidoglio to the Forum we catch a clear view of Monte Cavo's lofty lines, a view that reminds us of the *Albani... patres*, sires of sons who one day should rear the *altae moenia Romae*.

Descending the Via dell' Arco di Settimio Severo we pass over the northern wing of the Augustan Temple of Concord. The transition from the Temple of Iuno Moneta to the Temple of Concordia is admirably supplied by Ovid's lines (*Fasti* 1.637–639):

Candida, te niveo posuit lux proxima templo,  
qua fert sublimes alta Moneta gradus;  
nunc bene prospicies Latiam, Concordia, turbam.

A further connection between the two fanes is to be found in the person of Camillus, the builder of both.

The actual remains of the Aedes Concordiae, although likely to escape notice entirely, preserve evidence of three distinct periods in the history of the

\*Larger sections can be seen in the Museo Mussolini, and along the road winding up on the northwest side of the Palazzo dei Conservatori.



temple. The visible remains, marble, concrete (containing red mortar), travertine, and Anio stone, belong largely to the Aedes Concordiae Augustae constructed by Tiberius, in 10 A. D.; the grayish yellow concrete (the earliest concrete in Rome) embedded in the podium at the southeast corner is part of the structure built by Opimius, in 121 B. C.; the *caementa* of this concrete (yellow grotta Oscura tufa and scoriated Fidenae tufa) represents broken-up pieces of the Etruscan stone out of which the temple erected by Camillus was built, in 366 B. C. As I stated in a previous study of this material<sup>7</sup>,

It is interesting to note that, while each of these three temples was dedicated to Concord, it was a different Concord that was conceived in each case. It was the Concord of the plebeians to whom a monument was raised in 366 B. C. It was the Concord of the patricians that was glorified in the splendid edifice of Opimius. In 10 A. D. it was the Concord of the empire. That Opimius should have erected a temple to Concord so vexed the people that there was carved one night beneath the inscription on the temple, "Discord rears this temple to Concord"—a note of resentment that was sounded again by Augustine several centuries later. As for the Tiberian temple, it was simply the embodiment, in another form, of the idea emphasized in the Pax Augusta.

But this Augustan peace was based on power, and in a sense carried on the policy of Camillus and the Romans of old. Compare 6. 824-825:

Quin Decios Drusosque procul saevumque securi  
aspice Torquatum et referentem signa Camillum.

The shining, snow-white Temple of Concord that dominated the entire Forum in the time of Augustus was proclaiming, to all, this message of peace based on power (6. 847-853).

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the symbolism employed in this Temple of Concord (or Peace) was the use of Mercury and Hercules as marble sentinels flanking and protecting the approach to the shrine. Mercury, of course, symbolizes trade and diplomacy; Hercules symbolizes force, military force. The two thereby emphasize the very elements which, as Professor Rostovtzeff argues<sup>8</sup>, were the outstanding elements in Augustus's policy of peace:

... The principal factors in the extension and consolidation of Roman influence in the East were diplomacy and trade. But they were supported by strong military forces and by a strenuous military activity. An identical policy was followed in Egypt and Arabia and in Northern Africa....

By these means a lasting peace was secured for the Roman Empire....

This view seems to be supported by the frequent use that is made of Mercury and Hercules in the poetry of Vergil and Horace. Hercules, in fact, serves as the inspiration for many a reverential line. Compare e. g. 8. 185-189:

Rex Euandrus ait: "Non haec sollemnia nobis,  
has ex more dapes, hanc tanti numinis aram  
vana superstitio veterumque ignara deorum  
imposuit: saevis, hospes Troiane, periclis  
servati facinus meritosque novamus honores".

The whole passage, through 305, deserves study in this

connection. In it Hercules stands out as Savior and Protector of the Romans, the very embodiment of Mars Ultor and that distinguished descendant of Mars and Romulus who reared two temples to Mars the Avenger—Augustus himself, the savior and benefactor of a grateful people. As Hercules is worshipped and received his honors due, so Augustus deserves, at least, to be worshipped and extolled with reverent praise. Augustus is Hercules returned to earth, even as, in Horace, he is Maia's son in human guise (*Carmina* 1. 2. 41-52):

sive mutata iuvenem figura  
ales in terris imitatis almae  
filius Maiae, patiens vocari  
Caesaris ultor,  
serus in caelum redeas, diuque  
laetus intersis populo Quirini,  
neve te nostris vitiis iniquom  
ocior aura  
tollat; hic magnos potius triumphos,  
hic ames dici pater atque princeps,  
neu sinas Medos equitare inultos,  
te duce, Caesar.

Before we leave the Temple of Concord we should take advantage of the view across the Forum from this point. Since the Palatine is in front of us and the Carcer (on the Via Marforio) is behind us, our thoughts will naturally run to Cicero and Catiline, and perhaps to Plutarch's account of the death of Lentulus (Plutarch, Cicero 22: I give the translation by B. Perrin, in The Loeb Classical Library, 7.135):

... And first he [= Cicero] took Lentulus from the Palatine hill and led him along the Via Sacra and through the middle of the forum, the men of highest authority surrounding him as a body-guard, and the people shuddering at what was being done and passing along in silence, and especially the young men, as though they thought they were being initiated with fear and trembling into some ancient mysteries of an aristocratic regime. When Cicero had passed through the forum and reached the prison, he delivered Lentulus to the public executioner with the order to put him to death....

The occasion was a memorable one, and some forty years later Catiline himself came to be a symbol of iniquity in the art of Vergil (8. 666-670):

Hinc procul addit  
Tartareas etiam sedes, alta ostia Ditis,  
et scelerum poenas, et te, Catilina, minaci  
pendentem scopulo Furiarumque ora trementem,  
secretosque pios, his dantem iura Catonem.

The reference to Cato is timely, for it was in this vicinity—perhaps north of the Carcer—that M. Porcius Cato, the great Censor, built the historic Basilica Porcia, in 184 B. C.

In the northwest corner of the Forum, beneath us, are the remains of an ancient altar of Vulcan, the Volcanal, which was cut out of the native cappellaccio of the Capitoline slope. This altar corresponded to the above-mentioned altar of Saturn, which Hercules was said to have dedicated in the southwest corner of the Forum. Vulcan, to be sure, is introduced by Vergil in conformity with epic tradition (8. 729-731):

Talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis,  
miratur, rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet,  
attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum.

<sup>7</sup>Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 5 (1925), 54-55.  
<sup>8</sup>On page 53 of the work cited in note 2, above.

But the important place assigned to Vulcan in the Aeneid was due, probably, to the continued importance of Vulcan (witness the Volcanal and its cult<sup>9</sup>) in Roman life. The proximity of the Volcanal and the Temple of Venus Genetrix—a lotus-tree in the Volcanal was said to have roots extending to Caesar's Forum—recalls the close association of Vulcan and Venus in Vergil's story (8. 370-373, 533-540).

(To be concluded)

AMHERST COLLEGE

HOMER F. REBERT

### REVIEWS

Der Ethische Aufbau der Ilias und der Odyssee. By Roland Herkenrath, S. J. Schöningh: Paderhorn (1928). Pp. 384.

The volume entitled *Der Ethische Aufbau der Ilias und der Odyssee* is the posthumous work of a man who, throughout a long life, studied, loved, and taught Homer. It attempts to show by an analysis of the Iliad and the Odyssey that the unity of each depends on its moral lesson, which, in brief, is this: Zeus, the omniscient and omnipotent guardian of the moral law (15, 17), unerringly exacts full atonement for every infraction of this law. Hector sins by becoming a conscious accomplice in the violation of the truce, and pays for this sin with his life. Achilles atones by the death of Patroclus for his refusal of Agamemnon's offer of full satisfaction for his insult, and by his own death (in the sequel) for his inhuman treatment of Hector's body. The sin for which Odysseus atones by ten years of exile and the troubles awaiting him in Ithaca is a passionate desire for adventure, which banishes from his mind all fear of the gods and all thought of obligation to wife, family, and estate. Circe and Calypso make him forget Penelope, but the seven years spent on Ogygia bring him to a better mind, and he is adamant against the temptation to marry Nausicaa and spend his days in comfort among the Phaeacians. Achilles is swayed by the single motive of selfish and overweening desire for personal glory, and the actions and the words of Hector, and of Odysseus after the events of the Apologue, reveal a constant recognition of sin.

The author's analysis, though it is often suggestive and at times even illuminating, is not likely to be accepted. It is brought to the attention of American students of Homer to illustrate four important principles of Homeric interpretation which it continually disregards.

The first is the Aristarchan rule, 'Let Homer explain Homer'. The poet does not refer to any share which Hector may have had in the violation of the truce. He refrains altogether from giving a reason for the advance of the Trojan army (Iliad 4. 221); he keeps the spotlight of the narrative meanwhile on the wounded Menelaus. Hector utters no word to indicate that he felt himself answerable for the resumption of hostilities. The only folly which he admits is in keeping the army on the field after Achilles appeared at the trench. This

<sup>9</sup>A dedicatory inscription of 9 B. C. includes Augustus among those who honored this sanctuary.

error of judgment occurs after Hector violated the knight's code of honor by appropriating to himself the armor of Patroclus, to which he had no claim. This is the only fault for which Zeus blames Hector (Iliad 17. 205-206). The guilt of which Father Herkenrath thinks Hector is always mindful is never mentioned, directly or indirectly, in the Iliad.

The argument about the guilt of Achilles in rejecting Agamemnon's offer rests on no better evidence. Agamemnon by no means offered full atonement; he omitted an apology for the insult. Nestor urges (Iliad 9. 113) that satisfaction be made to Achilles 'with kindly gifts and gentle words'; Agamemnon offers the first, but withholds the second (compare 160). Nestor recognizes his failure to make the *amende honorable*, by saying (164), *δῶρα μὲν οὐκ ἐστὶ δῖον ἀπὸ δίδου* 'Ἀχιλλῆϊ δῶκεται', 'as touching the gifts, your offer to Achilles leaves nothing to be desired'; his silence about the 'gentle words' is almost clamorous. The *hybris* for which Achilles is punished by the loss of Patroclus is not his refusal of Agamemnon's offer, but his rejection of the pleas of Phoenix and Aias. His other assumed sin, and the guilt of Odysseus, will be considered presently.

A second principle of interpretation, also laid down by Aristarchus, is violated by the author when he assigns to the poet sentiments expressed by the characters. No one has yet discovered in either the Iliad or the Odyssey a 'raisonneur' of the poet. Therefore it is extremely hazardous to see in the words of a speaker in the poems an expression of the poet's own views, as Father Herkenrath does repeatedly. For example, he cites as evidence that the death of Achilles is in atonement for the outraging of Hector's body the dying words of Hector (Iliad 22. 358-360): 'Take heed now, lest I become the cause of the gods' anger against you on the day when Paris and Apollo slay you at the Scaean Gates'. The prophetic vision of the dying is here used to warn Achilles of what will happen to him if he persists in rejecting Hector's plea. But Hector has not mentioned the possible outraging of his corpse; he has begged that his body be given back for burial (342), and be not thrown to the dogs (339). Achilles ultimately does give back the body. To read into Hector's dying words any foreshadowing by the poet of the dragging of Hector's body behind the chariot of Achilles is to violate Aristarchus's sound rule of interpretation *ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου*, 'let the character speak for himself, not for the poet'.

Similar to this rule is another, which may be termed the interpretation *ἐκ τοῦ τόπου*, 'with due reference to the passage' (i. e. the context). It differs in applying to episodes, rather than to characters. This principle of interpretation is violated when a detail of action, or the words of a speaker which the poet uses to give greater effectiveness to the immediate situation, and never mentions again, is assumed to bear upon the analysis of portions of the poem outside of its context. The violation of this principle has led to the discovery of many 'contradictions' which are spurious, not real, and in the work under review to groundless inferences. Let us take a single example, this time from the Odyssey. At the beginning of the poem Zeus says

that the evils of men spring from their own folly in spite of warning from heaven (1. 33-37). Such a warning to Odysseus the author finds in the prophecy which Halitherses (so he tells the Ithacans) made to Odysseus when the latter was embarking for Troy (2. 172-176). These two passages, especially the second, are foundation-stones on which the author builds his argument that the unifying idea of the *Odyssey* is that of atonement for sin against religion and morality. Now, aside from the fact that this prophecy is mentioned as a warning above all to the suitors (162), and that its central idea is that Odysseus will return (176), the whole speech of Halitherses is used for the sake of the episode, not for the sake of its bearing on the character of Odysseus. The poet never again refers, or permits any of his characters, least of all Odysseus, to refer to the hero's knowledge of this prophecy. The poet forgets that the prophecy was made to Odysseus, as he forgets other details which he uses for the sake of the immediate situation. Tiresias tells Odysseus about the suitors (11. 116); later, Odysseus is not aware of their existence (13. 385). At Pylus, Mentor-Athena mentions the name of Telemachus in her prayer to Poseidon (3. 60); at verse 69 Nestor asks the strangers who they are. At the games in Scheria Odysseus tells the Phaeacians that he was famous as a bowman at Troy (8. 220); the same evening Alcinoüs has no suspicion that his guest had fought in the war (8. 581). Leucothea tells Odysseus (5. 344-345) that he will safely reach the land of the Phaeacians; after Odysseus has reached this land he wonders where he is (6. 119). Wilamowitz (*Homerische Untersuchungen*, 137 [Berlin, 1884]) sees here a contradiction; it is no more so than is the poet's treatment, in Book 1, of the spear of Athena, which, for all we are told, remains forever in the palace of Odysseus (*Schol.* on *Odyssey* 4. 52). In all these instances the poet has either forgotten or ignored a detail which has been used solely for its value in a special situation.

The fourth and the most important principle which Father Herkenrath disregards, along with countless critics of the poet, beginning with Xenophanes, is that Homer must be interpreted as a poet who sings his songs for the delight of mankind, and for no other purpose. As a moral teacher Homer has been placed correctly once for all by Sainte Beuve<sup>1</sup> in his famous comparison of the poet to the statue of a god in a garden, dispensing the waters of a fountain, but oblivious of his task. A deeply moral atmosphere pervades the Homeric Poems because a tragic outcome of human life is determined largely by conduct, and because Homer was, as Plato says (*Republic* 607 A), the first of the tragic poets. If we are to infer Homer's aim from his own words, we must say that it was to adorn the tale, not to point the moral. The ethical teaching of Homer is not called directly to our attention, but issues imperceptibly from the narrative. Father Herkenrath lays too much stress on the importance of the moral lesson of the poems in determining their unity (5: 'The entire progress of the action is shaped to

conform with the ethical principle on which the structure of the plot is based').

Nor do I accept without qualification the author's thesis that Homer's gods are surrogates for the cosmic moral law (332). Homer must reflect in his poetry both his own and his characters' moral standards and the religious views of his time. But in doing this he has contrived to glorify, not the Olympians, but man. If there is any paramount moral of the poems, it is that the obstacles and the limitations in the life of mortals have produced a higher type of morality, a finer grain of manhood and womanhood, and even a more real happiness than is found in the world of unlimited and unchecked power on Olympus. For pointing this moral Homer should be the patron saint of the neo-humanists.

Homer's gods are gods only to men, and they are gods in a very limited sense. Man fears their anger and seeks their favor and their help, but he never communes with them. Homer does not call them wise or good. To Homer the gods are not spirit, but, as Nillson<sup>2</sup> says, 'power'; and the poet sees very clearly that power alone, without wisdom and goodness, without spiritual qualities, produces only a material pleasure which does not satisfy, or bring happiness. There is a wide gulf between the Zeus of Homer and the Zeus of Cleanthes. What the Germans have styled the 'Götterburleske' in Homer is the result of a penetrating observation of the secret of human happiness, an 'inner check' inspired by a lofty ideal. Remove this moral control, as Homer does when he clears the mist from our eyes and shows us the Olympians as primitive fancy pictured them, immortal, but soulless, all-powerful, but neither good nor wise, beings of action and self-indulgence, but not of contemplation or aspiration, and we have a picture of what man may lose of happiness if he emulates these old Olympians and becomes lord of nature, without being lord of himself.

The mist which is over the eyes of Homer's characters shuts out the view of Olympus and its philosophy of material power. Man's growing capacity to guide his life by the 'inner check' leads him to transfer the keeping of this curb from himself to divinity, which Homer and his characters call 'Zeus', *θεός, θεός*. This divinity is not the violent, sensual, and altogether un-moral head of the Olympian family. It is a diviner being, evolved by extending the idea of *hybris* so that it applies not only to the realm of 'power' but also to that of the super-power which is the power of the spirit. Homer does not appear to have completed this extension: the reformation of Greek religion, as voiced by the poets, seems to have owed much to the Dorians, for the higher view is most clearly seen in the poetry of Pindar, who could not speak of evil in a god, whereas both Euripides and Aeschylus (in the *Prometheus*) reflect the dualism of Homer's theology.

In Father Herkenrath's book there is a deeper truth than that which he attempts to establish by chapter and verse from Homer. It is that any work of poetry

<sup>1</sup>*Études sur Virgile*, 87 (Paris, 1883).

<sup>2</sup>*A History of Greek Religion*, translated from the Swedish, by F. J. Fielden, 171 (Oxford, 1925).



which can rightly claim to be universal satisfies the needs of widely differing centuries and of all sorts and conditions of men. The Stoics were content with Homer as allegory; Father Herkenrath by reading into Homer his own profound religious feeling created a new Homer for himself and for those whom he may convince—and so must every Homeric scholar and lover of Homer.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT,  
BURLINGTON, VERMONT

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

The Development of Virgil's Art. By Henry W. Prescott. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1927). Pp. xii + 490.

Professor H. W. Prescott's book, *The Development of Virgil's Art*, is interesting, instructive, and eminently sound. In the Preface Professor Prescott states (vii) that his purpose is to indicate Virgil's "place in the history of literature and in the development of literary types...", and he adds:

...I have also had in mind teachers and students of Virgil in our high schools and colleges to whom Virgil's *Aeneid* is often too largely a means of learning the Latin language rather than a literary masterpiece worthy of their best appreciative power. For such an audience documentation and pretentious learning are out of place. And the size of the book has led to the omission of bibliography and erudite footnote, which more learned readers can easily supply from their own resources.

The author's purpose as announced in the title and in the Preface is admirably fulfilled. Virgil's relation to the life and thought of classical antiquity, both past and contemporary, is clearly shown; and against the background thus furnished we see the Roman poet's powers grow in breadth and depth till they reach their maturity in the composition of the *Aeneid*, the national epic.

The body of the book consists of four unnumbered chapters, as follows: Virgil's Literary Heritage (1-17); The Atmosphere of Virgil's Youth and Early Manhood (18-75); The Poetry of the Field and Farm (76-137); The National Epic (138-481). To the Index pages 485-490 are devoted.

In the first chapter the development of Latin literature up to the time of Virgil is indicated briefly but clearly. Especial reference is made to the relation of Roman poetry to its Greek models, and in particular to those of the Hellenistic period.

Professor Prescott begins the next chapter with a concise and, in the main, clear exposition of the main sources of our knowledge of Virgil's life, but it is to be feared that many of the readers for whom the book is intended will be left with a vague or erroneous impression in regard to the *Vita Vergili*, by Donatus (Suetonius). After an explanation of the difficulties of extricating the truth from the "curious mixture of plausible fact with positive fiction or distorted truth" found in the tradition, the author writes (20):

...With the exception of *The Salad* and *The Cabaret Girl*, these poems <i. e. the poems of the Appendix Vergiliana> are ascribed to Virgil in the account of his life attached to the name of Donatus, which is itself

probably an amplification of a biography written by Suetonius in the early part of the second century after Christ....

The statement about Donatus's *Life of Vergil* is misleading. In this part of the second chapter the author should, in some manner, have made clear the following facts: first, that apart from the poems themselves the *Vita* compiled by Donatus is our principal source for biographical knowledge of Vergil; second, that this *Vita* exists at present in an amplified form and that the elements in it due to Donatus have been isolated with a very considerable degree of certainty; third, that in its original form it was in the main a fourth century abridgment of Suetonius's sketch of Vergil; and, finally, that from this fourth century form of Donatus's *Vita* are derived to a greater or less extent the other extant lives of Vergil.

Vergil's family, birth, and education are mentioned briefly by Professor Prescott. The bulk of the chapter consists of excellent discussions and analyses of the poems<sup>1</sup> of the Appendix together with a considerable amount of material pertinent to various points and problems connected with them. The author's position with respect to the authenticity of these poems is quite properly circumscribed and cautious. Because the interest and the attention of Vergilian scholars are at the present time so largely focussed on the Appendix, it will be of interest to quote Professor Prescott's conclusions in regard to the different pieces contained in it and his reasons for using them as data for developing the theme of his book. His conclusions are as follows (72):

One may readily sympathize with the growing tendency, among recent interpreters of the *Virgilian Appendix*, to regard all or most of these pieces as so many documents of the poet's slowly developing genius. But a conservative review of the evidence can hardly result in anything but the moderate assertion that *The Gnat* and most, if not all, the epigrams of *In Lighter Vein* are more surely attested as Virgil's work than the rest; that of the remainder the external evidence of authenticity is never earlier than the second century A. D., if the list of works in Donatus' *Life* goes back to Suetonius; and that some of them are not clearly stamped as Virgil's until the ninth century. The internal evidence for and against authenticity is extremely complicated and correspondingly difficult to analyze and evaluate. It is, however, altogether probable that many of the poems illustrate the general trend of Latin poetry between the years 55 and 42 B. C. If not by Virgil, they are by his contemporaries and possibly his friends. And we may with some security infer the probable range of his interests and the initial developments in his career from these examples of the literary products of his youth<sup>2</sup> as well as from the actual facts in the biographical tradition.

In the third chapter the author deals with the Eclogues and the Georgics. Against the literary and political background he exposes Vergil's somewhat mediocre accomplishment in the Eclogues, but indicates the advances made in certain poems of this group. As we should expect, he deals conservatively and soberly with the treacherous question of allegorical interpre-

<sup>1</sup>Epigrams 3, 8, and 14 are not mentioned, and the *Aetna* is included in the Appendix.

<sup>2</sup>To me the expression "the literary products of his youth" seems unhappily ambiguous. C. K. >



tation, admitting the allegory where it is plausible and properly supported, denying it or reserving judgment in the other cases. In his discussion of the Georgics he sets forth the problems which confronted Vergil and the materials with which the poet had to work. He then shows how Vergil used his materials and met the problems and how, instead of producing a mosaic composed of old pieces arranged in a new pattern, he brought forth a "completely fused mass in which fact and fancy may be imitative rather than original, but the resultant whole is inimitable", a truly artistic work instinct with beauty, pathos, and patriotism.

The fourth and by far the longest chapter in the book deals with the National Epic. This chapter is divided into ten sections: I. The Social and Political Background (138-152), II. The Legend of Aeneas (153-168), III. Epic Tradition (169-245), IV. The Story of Dido (246-300), V. The Fall of Troy (301-338), VI. The Wanderings of Aeneas (339-358), VII. The Descent to the Lower World (359-410), VIII. The Life after Death in Popular Fancy and Speculative Theory (411-427), IX. The War in Latium (428-462), X. The Characters of the *Aeneid* (463-481). In this chapter the author follows in general the same method that he employed in writing the chapter on the Eclogues and the Georgics. He shows how the times were ripe for writing the Epic of Rome and how the poet was ready to write it, and he shows, too, the material that went into Vergil's alembic and the products of the magician's skill that came forth. It is impossible to present in a review Professor Prescott's treatment of the various topics listed above; the student of Vergil should read in detail the author's own words. However, as the summing up of the way in which Vergil composed the story of Dido not only admirably illustrates Professor Prescott's method but is peculiarly adapted to quotation, I will give it in full (299-300):

Virgil's methods, then, not only in the story of Dido, but throughout his poem, may be seen clearly in this small feature of the Carthaginian episode. In Virgil three great lines of Greek literary tradition converge: Homeric epic, Greek tragedy, Hellenistic sentimental poetry. The Homeric epic furnished the outline of a wanderer telling a narrative of adventure to hospitable friends, and a Homeric world of divinities intervening in human action; Greek tragedy provided a dramatic structure and various means of securing dramatic effects; Hellenistic poetry was rich in the details of the sentimental situation, though they often had to be dignified and purified for the new environment of Virgil's epic. If Virgil took the story of Dido and Aeneas and made it over under the influence of these various literary precedents, we are not, in so describing his work, denying him the highest kind of originality. On the contrary, by using all that is best worthy of imitation in his predecessors he has again constructed a new whole that is inimitable. . . .

In writing *The Development of Virgil's Art*, the author has to some extent followed Vergil's method. In the Preface he acknowledges his indebtedness to Leo, Skutsch, Jahn, Norden, and in particular Heinze, but this does not mean that his book has not originality, and certainly it is a work of art, an organic whole, carefully constructed and closely knit.

This book deserves, and will doubtless have, wide use. In the event of another printing the following matters might well be corrected. The author is rather unduly addicted to the use of the historical present. This trick of style gives a somewhat unidiomatic and Latin turn to the author's otherwise excellent English. On page 396, line 15 occurs the only printer's error which I have observed. Here the sense is hopelessly garbled. But these are very small matters. Professor Prescott has produced a book which is comprehensive and useful, and which is written in so simple and straightforward a style that the casual reader may easily fail to realize fully the extensive and exact knowledge which the author had at his command and from which he drew unstintingly.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

HOLMES V. M. DENNIS, 3d.

A review of this book ought to reproduce certain statements contained in its Preface—and then to criticize those statements. One wants to know, for example, how much of this book is the result of Professor Prescott's own study of the poems of Vergil (in other words, how much of the book is Professor Prescott himself), and how much is due to the reproduction or summarizing of the work of others.

In the Preface (viii) we find this statement:

. . . In the chapters on the *Aeneid* I owe the discussion of Virgil's political and social environment largely to Norden's study in the *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* (VII [1901], 249 ff., 313 ff.), and the chapter on the sixth book of the *Aeneid* is an attempt to make a synthesis of the material which Norden has scattered through his learned commentary on that book.

In *The American Journal of Philology* 27 (1906), 70-83, in a review of the first edition of the work that Professor Prescott has in mind here (*Aeneis VI. Erklärt von Eduard Norden* [Leipzig, Teubner, 1903]), I showed that there is no more justification for reproducing exactly all that Norden says in this book than there is for accepting, without reservation, all that any body else says. Professor Prescott should have done what he could have done very well—as an *εργον*, an *ergon*, however, a *vocatio*, not as a *παρεργον*, *parergon*, an *avocatio*, that is, he should have subjected Norden's views to critical examination, showing clearly wherein he differed from them, wherein he agreed with them—especially wherein he differed from them. I think it is particularly unfair to present to the very sort of readers that, according to his Preface, Professor Prescott had in mind, statements that are not founded in anything except the writer's imagination. Such statements have been made far too often in recent years about Vergil, by Norden as by others. Particularly saddening are the unwarranted statements so often made in recent times concerning Vergil's earliest years. On that subject we *know* little—nothing at all if the statements of ancient authorities are without value, or of no independent value (as some have declared them to be)<sup>1</sup>. Guesses by any author, however brilliant author and guesses are, are of no value.

<sup>1</sup>See my remarks in *The Classical Journal* 19 (1924), 200, note 4, on the views of Professor Duane Reed Stuart, of Princeton University.

In his Preface (viii-ix) Professor Prescott writes further:

My chief indebtedness in the account of the *Aeneid* is to the epoch-making work of Richard Heinze, *Virgils Epische Technik*. The first part of his book, which analyzes the *Aeneid* with the exception of Book vi, I have paraphrased, rearranged, condensed, and expanded, and the pages of character treatment in the second part have been used for the final chapter of my book. For the liberty to use Professor Heinze's work so freely I am greatly indebted to the generous courtesy of his publisher, B. G. Teubner, of Leipzig and Berlin.

On all this I remark first that it would have been well for Professor Prescott to give a hint that Heinze's work had passed through several editions. I should myself have given the dates of all the editions, and have indicated which edition I had used in my work on this book.

I remark next that I can conceive of no reason (except, perhaps, desire to economize time) why Professor Prescott should have produced a book on Vergil which is so largely a synthesis of the statements of others. The result is that in the book under review we have neither Professor Heinze nor Professor Prescott. At any rate we do not derive from the book the faintest idea where the work of the one stops, and that of the other begins. Nor can one, without a meticulous comparison of the English book with the German, determine whether Professor Prescott has been properly critical of the German work. I have remarked, incidentally, in *The Classical Journal* 19 (1924), 203, note 6, how utterly without foundation a portentous utterance by Professor Heinze sometimes is. In a long note he professes to discuss critically the question whether Naevius had anticipated Vergil in bringing Aeneas into touch with Dido. This note, however, is a mere collection of idle words; it has all the appearance of a scholarly discussion, but it is absolutely futile.

I cannot refrain from taking issue on another count with Professor Prescott's book. Professor Prescott says (Preface, vii), "... For such an audience documentation and pretentious learning are out of place..." The first half of this sentence is not true; the second part

is a needless platitude. *Pretentious* learning is always out of place; *proper* documentation is never out of place. To my way of thinking no one should put out the sort of book Professor Prescott has put out to serve as a book for teachers in the High Schools. Such teachers need to be reminded constantly that there are more things in heaven and in earth than are dreamt of in their ordinary philosophy. Every scholar should take every opportunity to remind teachers (and other scholars too!) that there are such things as books (and articles); he should, out of the very plenitude of his learning, tell teachers what the books are, and he should differentiate them one from another, on the basis of trustworthiness. In particular, teachers need to be warned against certain books—especially books that are without documentation. Every one, including teachers in the High Schools, should be encouraged always to go back of what is said by the book in front of him to a consideration of the materials, secondary (or even tertiary) or primary, to test at every turn what is offered to him as truth. Teachers need also to learn the very important lesson that, when an author gets outside the realm of the objective—something which he may do very soon, when he talks or writes about the life of Vergil—he is entering debatable territory, and that he can make few statements that will not be challenged by some one else, as earnest as he is himself, and as eager a seeker after the truth (at least in his own conviction). I think, then, that Professor Prescott erred badly in eliminating from the book under review as largely as he did bibliographical matter. Certainly his cavalier allusion to Heinze's book, the work to which he owes so much, is avoidance of documentation run mad.

A careful translation—frankly a translation—of Heinze's book and of Norden's edition of *Aeneid* 6 would be very valuable. Professor Prescott could have given us such a translation. He also could have given us his own interpretation of Vergil. In the work under review he has done neither of these things.

CHARLES KNAPP